

**Remarks****I. Status of the Application**

Claims 82 and 84-99 are pending in the application. Claims 84-99 are added. Claims 57-81 and 83 are cancelled without prejudice.

**II. Double Patenting**

Claims 57-69 have been rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double-patenting as being allegedly unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,456,709. Claims 70-81 have been rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double-patenting as being allegedly unpatentable over claim 16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,456,709. Claim 83 has been rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double-patenting as being allegedly unpatentable over claim 13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,456,709.

Claims 57-69, 70-81, and 83 are cancelled.

**III. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

Claims 82-83 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being allegedly indefinite. In particular, the Examiner alleges that the term “a caller” recited in lines 5, 9, and 12 is unclear.

Claim 82 is amended as shown above. Claim 83 is cancelled.

**IV. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

Claims 57-61, 63, 68, 70-75, 80 and 83 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,181,237 (“Dowden”). While disagreeing with the rejection, to further prosecution, claims 57-61, 63, 68, 70-75, 80 and 83 are cancelled

without prejudice. The applicants reserve the right to file a continuation application including the claims identical to or broader than the rejected claims.

## **V. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

### **Claim 62**

Claim 62 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Dowden. Claims 64-67 and 76-79 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Dowden in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,764,731 ("Yablon"). Claims 69 and 81 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Dowden in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,835,570 ("Wattenbarger"). Claims 62, 64-67, 69, 76-79, and 81 are cancelled without prejudice.

## **VI. Allowable Subject Matter - Claim 82**

Claim 82 has been objected to due to its rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, as discussed above, but would be allowable if rewritten in proper form including all of its limitations.

Claim 82 is amended as indicated above.

## **VII. New Claims 84-99**

### New Claims 84-90

New dependent claims 84-90 are added to recite additional features of the technology described in the specification. New claims 84-90 all depend from amended claim 82, which is allowable. Support for new claims 84-90 is found at page 16, line 15, to page 17, line 20, for example.

Because new claims 84-90 all depend from allowable claim 82, the new claims are also allowable.

New Claims 91-99


New independent claim 91 is a system claims that corresponds to amended method claim 82, which is allowable. Support for new claim 91 is found in original claim 65, in Fig. 1, and at pages 23-24, for example. New dependent claims 92-99 depend from new claim 91.

Because new claim 91 corresponds to allowable claim 82, new claim 91 is also allowable. In addition, new claims 92-99, which depend from new claim 91, are also allowable.

**VIII. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, each of claims 82 and 84-99, as amended, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of these claims is requested and allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully,

By   
Brandon N. Sklar  
Reg. No. 31,667  
212-836-8653

Date: October 26, 2007

Kaye Scholer LLP  
425 Park Avenue  
New York, New York 10022